

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 19-48 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 6, 9-12, and 15-18 were previously canceled in a prior Office Action Response. Claims 1, 5, and 13 are amended.

Claims 1, 5, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In a telephone interview on May 18, 2004 with Examiner Thu Ha Nguyen, it was clarified that the "destination address" refers to the address of the remote storage device. It was agreed to replace the term "destination address" with the term "address" in claims 1, 5, and 13 to remove any unintended ambiguity. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is believed to have now been overcome.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 13-14, and 19-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unno U.S. Pat. 6,437,875, in view of Manglapus et al. U.S. Pat. 6,219,151. In the May 18, 2004 interview with Examiner Nguyen, it became apparent that at least part of the claim rejections resulted from a misinterpretation of claim limitations. Much of these misinterpretations have been clarified by the claim amendments described above addressing the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

It was clarified for example, that many of the Uno based rejections make reference to the Uno's description of his copy/fax machine's internal architecture, internal file management, or computer operating system. However, the present invention is not directed towards any of those areas. Rather, the present invention is drawn toward file transfer management among multiple machines on a network.

Also the difference between sending an email, which identifies a user, and an sending an address of a remote location, which identifies a specific machine, were clarified.

In reference to claims 3 and 7, it was pointed out that these claims recite a "file format", which refers to the type of data encoding within a document (i.e. jpeg, bitmap, etc.), while the Unq reference describes different types of network communication protocols.

Lastly, it was clarified that in reference to claim 27, the destination device conditionally retrieves image data only if its physical parameters are capable of manipulating the image data. By contrast, Uno describes an input device having a universal sending module 1504 capable of transmitting several types of inputted data.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosalio Haro

Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: June 4, 2004

BEST AVAILABLE COPY